

REMARKS

This paper is a response to the Final Office Action (“Office Action”) mailed December 6, 2006.

Current claim status:

In the Office Action, the Office stated that Claims 9, 30, 31, 36 and 37 are allowable.

Claims 1-10, 30, 31, 34-37, 39, and 43-51 were subjected to a double-patenting rejection.

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 34-35, and 43-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being obvious over Sakai (USP 5,613,135), in view of Townsley(USP 5,557,7738) and Kobayashi (5,463,742).

Claims 3 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being obvious over Sakai (USP 5,613,135), in view of Townsley(USP 5,557,7738) and Kobayashi (5,463,742), and further in view of Ed Nisley “Two-Way Power Line Communications”.

Arguments

With regard to claims 1-3, 4-8, 10, 34-35, 43, 44, 47-51, Applicant reiterates many of the arguments presented with the Office Action Response of October 24.

Double Patenting Rejections

Applicant retracts arguments made herein and submits a Terminal Disclaimer to overcome the Double Patenting rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicant requests reconsideration of this rejection in view of the amendment to Claim 1, and for reasons presented.

The limitation of claim 1 recites:

detecting that an external computing device is actively connected to transfer data and provide power to the portable computing device

In Applicant's response of October 24, 2006, Applicant argued that an obviousness rejection could not be sustained because this limitation was not taught by any of the references, either individually or when combined. The Examiner response in the Office Action was "One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combination of references." Applicant agrees with the principal, but respectfully submits that "all claim limitations of the claimed invention are not taught by the combined references." MPEP 2143.03 As noted by the Examiner, Sakai discloses use of an AC adapter, and not an external computing device. Furthermore, Kobayashi uses power from an external device to turn on (Column 3, line 48-50), and Applicant believes that the PPM device of Kobayashi is not detecting power by simply turning on. Neither of these references, nor Townsley, teach the entire limitation recited above. For this reason, Applicant submits the prima facie requirements for making the obviousness rejection have not yet been met.

In order to further distinguish the claims, Applicant has also amended Claim 1 to recite that limitation of "detecting" is performed "while the portable computing device is operational to a user". As mentioned, Kobayashi is not operational when power is applied to the PPM, and Sakai does not disclose use of an external computer to provide power. As such, Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection in view of the remarks presented above, and the inclusion of these added words.

In addition, Claim 1 recites:

responsive to detecting the external computing device, suspending execution of at least a portion of a program

As mentioned in the October response, combined references do not teach this limitation. Applicant disagrees in the rationale of the rejection, in that none of the references cited teach "suspending execution" in response to "detecting the external computing device".

With regard to Claim 44, Applicant notes:

causing the external computing device and the portable computing device to communicate with one another in response to a user-interaction with an interface of the external computing device

Applicant reiterates the arguments made above and submits that Sakai does not teach an external computing device other than the portable computing device which provides an interface for receiving user-interaction, let alone enabling this interaction to cause communication to occur between the two computing devices.

With regard to any assumptions made by the Examiner that is based on knowledge outside of the references cited (as such an Official Notice), Applicant makes no admissions to the correctness of the statement, and reserves any right to object to the statement at a later time.

New Claims

New Claim 52 recites use of an intermediate power state and a low power state. Support for new independent Claim 52 includes the description on Page 10, line 17-23. The cited references do not teach use of the multiple power states as recited by claims 52-54.

New Claim 55 recites that the device is responsive to inactivity by powering off a backlight, independent of the display screen. The ability to power off the backlight independent of the display screen, in the context provided by the claim, is not taught by the cited references. Support for this claim includes the description provided on Page 12, lines 11-19.

New Claim 59 provides that the portable computing device is operable to display data when the feature for reducing power is suspended. Support for this feature is found on Page 11, line 23 to Page 12, Line 11.

New claim 63 recites a portable computing device that can detect a type of accessory device, and “execute a program for the type of accessory device”, among other features. Support for new claim 63 is found in the description accompanying FIG. 6 and elsewhere.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. The allowance of the claims is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if there are any issues that remain to be resolved prior to allowance of the claims.

A petition for a two (2) month extension of time is included herewith.

AUTHORIZATION TO CHARGE DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

Please charge deposit account 501914 for any underpayments in connection with this Office Action response.

Respectfully submitted,
Shemwell Mahamedi LLP

Date: January 5, 2007

/Zurvan Mahamedi/
Zurvan Mahamedi, Reg. No. 42,828
Tel. 408-551-6632

Shemwell Mahamedi LLP
4880 Stevens Creek Blvd., Suite 201
San Jose CA 95129